

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested. After entry of the foregoing amendment, Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-20, and 23-25 remain pending in the present application. Because the claims have been amended merely to address cosmetic matters of form, it is submitted that no new matter has been added.

By way of summary, the Office Action presented the following issues: the Office objected to Claim 1 as containing informalities; Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-15, 17, 19-20, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2002/0114466 to Tanaka et al. (hereinafter "Tanaka") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2003/0110131 to Alain et al. (hereinafter "Alain") and U.S. Patent No. 6,430,619 to Sitaraman et al. (hereinafter "Sitaraman"); Claims 8 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tanaka in view of Alain, Sitaraman, and U.S. Patent Application Publ'n No. 2002/0184515 to Oho et al. (hereinafter "Oho"); and Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Oho in view of Alain and Sitaraman.

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicants and Applicants' representative wish to thank Examiner Pich and Examiner Schwartz for the courtesy of the personal interview granted on March 18, 2010. During the interview, features of Applicants' Figure 6 were discussed. In addition, it was agreed that a *prima facie* case of obviousness had not been established with regard to the features of Claim 1. Comments similar to those presented during the interview are included herein.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

The Office objected to Claim 1 as containing informalities. During the interview, it was discussed that the “means for receiving grouped device identification information” can also perform the functions of “receiving key information” and of “receiving the license.” It is believed to be unnecessary to recite a separate means for performing each function. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to Claim 1.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 9-15, 17, 19-20, and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Tanaka in view of Alain and Sitaraman. Applicants respectfully traverse that rejection, because no proper combination of Tanaka, Alain, and Sitaraman discloses or suggests all of the features of independent Claims 1, 13, 19-20, and 23-25.

Indeed, it was agreed at the interview that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with regard to the features of Claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of Tanaka, Alain, and Sitaraman.

It is further submitted that independent Claims 19-20 and 23 patentably distinguish over those references for at least reasons analogous to those discussed during the interview with regard to Claim 1.

It is additionally submitted that, for reasons analogous to those discussed during the interview, no proper combination of Tanaka, Alain, and Sitaraman discloses or suggests the features of “the grouped device identification information identifying the key information, the key information decrypting an encrypted content . . . , the license identifying the grouped device identification information and being identified by the encrypted content,” as recited in independent Claim 13.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 13 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably distinguishes over any proper combination of Tanaka, Alain, and Sitaraman.

It is further submitted that independent Claims 19-20 and 23 patentably distinguish over those references for at least reasons analogous to those discussed during the interview with regard to Claim 1.

Applicants additionally submit that independent Claims 24-25 patentably distinguish over Tanaka, Alain, and Sitaraman, at least for analogous reasons to those set forth above with regard to Claim 13.

Independent Claim 19 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Oho in view of Alain and Sitaraman. Because Oho fails to disclose or suggest at least “means for reading out the license based on the encrypted content, for reading out the grouped device identification information based on the license, for reading out the key information based on the grouped device identification information, and for decrypting the encrypted content based on the key information,” it is submitted that Oho does not remedy the deficiencies of Alain and Sitaraman with regard to the features of Claim 19.

It is respectfully submitted that Claim 19 also patentably distinguishes over Oho.

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is patentably distinguished over the cited references and is in condition for allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 07/09)

Brian R. Epstein
Registration No. 60,329